

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-7349

JOHN LUCAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

KATHLEEN A. PINNER, Employed as Regional Administrator at the United States Parole Commission; WILLIAM D. TENNEY, Hearing Examiner, United States Parole Commission; L. CHAIT, Regional Administrator, United States Parole Commission; JOHN R. SIMPSON, COMMISSIONER, United States Parole Commission; LAUREN PRICE, Social Science Tech., United States Parole Commission; KOSTBAR, N.A.B. Analyst, United States Parole Commission; JASPER R. CLAY, JR., N.A.B. Chairman, United States Parole Commission; VINCENT J. FECHTEL, Commissioner, United States Parole Commission; KENNETH WALKER, Hearing Examiner, United States Parole Commission, R.C., N.A.B. Reviewer, United States Parole Commission; MICHAEL J. GAINES, Commissioner, United States Parole Commission; UNREADABLE SIGNATURE, Hearing Examiner, United States Parole Commission; OTHERS UNKNOWN AT PRESENT TIME,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (CA-99-2181-CCB)

Submitted: February 8, 2000

Decided: February 24, 2000

Before MURNAGHAN and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Lucas, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

John Lucas appeals the district court's dismissal as frivolous under 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(e) (West Supp. 1999) of his Bivens¹ action and the district court's denial of his motion for relief from judgment made pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal on the reasoning of the district court. See Lucas v. Pinner, No. 99-CV-2181 (D. Md. Aug. 2, 1999 and Aug. 24, 1999).² We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED

¹ Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

² Although the district court's orders are dated July 29, 1999, and August 23, 1999, respectively, the district court's records show that the orders were entered on the docket sheet on August 2, 1999, and August 24, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was physically entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).